

## REMARKS

Claims 32-42 remain in the present application. Claim 32 is amended herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendment. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Examiner Interview Summary

Bryan M. Failing and Anthony C. Murabito, representatives for Applicant, and Examiner Vu conducted a telephone Examiner Interview on December 17, 2007. Independent Claim 32 was discussed with respect to the Figure 1 of the present application. Examiner Vu indicated that independent Claim 32 would be allowable over Figure 1 if amended to include the limitations presented herein. Additionally, several specification amendments were suggested by Examiner Vu.

### Specification Amendments

Several specification amendments are made herein to correct informalities pointed out by Examiner Vu during the Examiner Interview on 12/17/07. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of these specification amendments. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's review and approval of these amendments.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 32-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Figure 1 of the present application (hereafter referred to as "Figure 1"). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the

embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 32-42 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Figure 1 for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 32, which recites an electronic system comprising (emphasis added):

- a first device for accessing a multimedia bit stream;
- a second device coupled to said first device and for generating a command requesting a table describing information in said multimedia bit stream, said command comprising:
  - a plurality of attribute fields comprising:
    - a table field for specifying a table identifier; and
    - a multi-purpose field for specifying a select attribute related to a requested table, said select attribute selected from among a plurality of possible attributes; and
    - a flag field for identifying said select attribute from said plurality of possible attributes held by said multi-purpose field; and

in response to receiving said command, wherein said first device is operable to:

- determine if said flag field indicates a rating region table is requested, and if so, use rating information in said multi-purpose field to provide said rating region table;
- determine if said flag field indicates an event information table is requested, and if so, use information in said multi-purpose field to provide said event information table; and
- determine if said flag field indicates an extended text table is requested, and if so, use information in said multi-purpose field to provide said extended text table.

Claims 33-42 depend from independent Claim 32 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Figure 1 fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “a multi-purpose field for specifying a select attribute related to a requested table” and “said select attribute selected from among a plurality of possible attributes” as recited in independent Claim 32. As recited and described in the present application, a command for requesting a table comprises a multi-purpose field for specifying a select attribute related to a requested table. The select attribute is selected from among a plurality of possible attributes.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Figure 1 shows attribute fields 260, each holding a *single* attribute. For example, attribute field 265 holds the attribute "source\_id (lsb)." In contrast, multi-purpose attribute field 523 as shown in Figure 5 of the present invention holds *multiple* attributes (e.g., "source\_id (lsb)," "rating\_region (lsb)," and "ETM\_id (second MSB)"). As such, none of attribute fields 260 as shown in Figure 1 is a multi-purpose field as claimed. Thus, Figure 1 fails to teach or suggest a multi-purpose field for specifying a select attribute related to a requested table where the select attribute is selected from among a plurality of possible attributes as claimed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Figure 1 fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a flag field for identifying said select attribute from said plurality of possible attributes held by said multi-purpose field" as recited in independent Claim 32. As recited and described in the present application, a flag field may be used to identify a select attribute from a plurality of possible attributes held by the multi-purpose field.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, flag fields 251 are for validating an attribute field containing a *single* attribute (Figure 1; see line 12 of page 3 of the present application). The single attribute held by each of attribute fields 260 is not a plurality of possible attributes as claimed. As such, flag fields 251 are not for identifying a select attribute from a plurality of possible attributes as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant reiterates that Figure 1 fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a flag field for identifying said select attribute from said plurality of possible attributes held by said multi-purpose field" as recited in independent Claim 32.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 32 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Figure 1, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of record. Since Claims 33-42 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 32, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 33-42 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 32-42 are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 32-42 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 12/31, 2007

Bmf

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060